DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 055 UD 004 615

By-Grambs, Jean D.

Report of the Leadership Conference on Institutes, December 16-19, 1964.

Maryland Univ., College Park. Coll. of Education.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Dec 64
Note-36p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.90
Descriptors-*Conference Reports, *Educational Equality, Federal Laws, Federal Programs, *Institutes (Training Programs), *Leadership Training, *School Integration
Identifiers-Civil Rights Act of 1964 Title 4

Reported is a conference devoted to some questions about school desegregation raised by the Equal Educational Opportunities Program authorized by Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Conferees focused on those issues which would be within the domain of training institutes funded under Title IV. The conference proceedings are summarized under the following headings: (1) dimensions of the school desegregation problems; (2) establishment of priorities for institute funding; (3) content, skills, and knowledge appropriate for the institutes; (4) design of the institutes for optimal learning; (5) strategies for change; (6) research and evaluation; (7) followup activities. (NH)

ED029055

The Equal Educational Opportunities Program

Report...

04615 E

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON INSTITUTES

University of Maryland
College of Education

UD 004 615

December 16-19, 1964

Jean D. Grambs
Conference Director and Reporter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Report of the

Leadership Conference on Institutes

conducted by the

University of Maryland, College of Education

and

United States Office of Education

in cooperation with

University of Maryland, University College
Conferences and Institutes Division

December 16-19, 1964

* * * * *

UD 004 615

The Conference reported herein was performed persuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

This conference marks the most significant step taken thus far to launch the U.S. Office of Education's Equal Educational Opportunities Program, authorized under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Francis Keppel,
United States Commissioner of Education
December 16, 1964

With this remark, Commissioner Keppel opened a four-day conference held under the auspices of the United States Office of Education and the College of Education of the University of Maryland.[1] The conference was organized to look at the following broad questions:

I. What are the dimensions of the problem of school desegregation which may be the focus of institutes supported by Federal funds under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

II. How can some priority be established upon which decisions can be made by the Equal Educational Opportunities Program of the U.S. Office of Education as to which type of institute, which target population, which area of concern--national or local-- might best be served by such Federally-supported institutes? Since the money for such institutes ($3,000,000 for fiscal year 1965 under Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) will not spread very far in terms of the vast need, it is hoped that one outcome of the Conference will be advice to the U.S. Office of Education regarding which programs would have the broadest "ripple effect."

III. What is the most appropriate content (knowledge, skills) for

---

[1]The conference was supported by funds allocated by the United States Office of Education under Title IV, Public Law 88-352.

such institutes, in terms of what types of participants, at what positions in the school desegregation process?

IV. What designs and processes for such institutes hold particular promise for optimal learning?

V. What strategies are of greatest potential in terms of school change, particularly in an area such as this, fraught with acute community emotion?

VI. What kinds of short-run evaluation and long-run research would be desirable, to help assess current efforts, and to provide some insight into more significant aspects of change within the institutional and community setting?

VII. Finally, what kinds of follow-up conferences, institutes, training programs, and leadership discussions would be recommended to further maximize the impact of institutes?

Conference Background

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorized the utilization of funds to further the orderly process of school desegregation through appropriate educational processes. The authorization, Title IV, Public Law 88-352, reads as follows:

TITLE IV--DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Definitions

Sec. 401. As used in this title--

"Commissioner." (a) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

"Desegregation." (b) "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

"Public school."

(c) "Public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution, and "public college" means any institution of higher education or any technical or vocational school above the secondary school level, provided that such public school or public college is operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated wholly or predominantly from or through the use of governmental funds or property, or funds or property derived from a governmental source.

"School board."

(d) "School board" means any agency or agencies which administer a system of one or more public schools and any other agency which is responsible for the assignment of students to or within such a system.

Survey and Report of Educational Opportunities

Report to President and Congress.

Sec. 402. The Commissioner shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Technical Assistance

Sec. 403. The Commissioner is authorized, upon the application of any school board, State, municipality, school district, or other governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools, to render technical assistance to such applicant in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies information regarding effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation, and making available to such agencies personnel of the Office of Education or other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with such problems.

Training Institutes

Sec. 404. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Individuals who attend such an institute on a full-time basis may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance at such institute in amounts specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including

Stipends, etc.

allowances for travel to attend such institute.

Grants

Sec. 405. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon application of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole or in part, the cost of--

(1) giving to teachers and other school personnel in-service training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation, and

(2) employing specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

Conditions.

(b) In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Commissioner shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

The funds to carry out these functions were made available several months after the passage of the law, and the task of assembling a staff was commenced. At the same time, a number of interested institutions and individuals were already making inquiries of the U.S. Office of Education regarding the establishment of summer institutes under Section 404 above. It became increasingly clear that, as noted in item II outlining the purposes of the University of Maryland conference, that the need was tremendous, but the financial assistance available could not possibly extend very far during the first year of operation.

It was clear to the U.S. Office of Education, therefore, that given the complexity of the training problems related to desegregation and the limited funds available, the counsel of competent advisers should be sought in developing the institutes program. In turn, of course, many legal questions had to be studied by the Office of General Counsel, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and some general procedural matters worked

out for the new program. Under extreme pressure of time, the staff was able to clear most of the legal problems, and circularize a preliminary set of guidelines for those interested in applying under the provisions of the Act.

Many questions remained unanswered, however. Meetings and consultations had been taking place over a period of 18 months, but it was hoped that by gathering a group of specialists in education, school administration, behavioral science, and community intergroup organization, many issues could be clarified and problems explored, and thus aid the program in moving ahead rapidly on the basis of expert advice and experience.

The conference at no time was considered to be a policy-making or policy-determining group. No votes were taken. Where consensus was apparent it was always with the caveat that those not present might enter other points of view for consideration. This report, therefore, reflects the varied opinions, experiences, and hopes of about 55 individuals representing many fields, many regions, many disciplines, and a variety of institutions, school systems, and community organizations.

Several points were made over and over again by the participants. They are essential to an understanding of this report, and will be repeated again at the conclusion of this report in order that there be as few grounds for misunderstanding as possible.

The kinds of institutes or institute programs which were envisioned covered a vast range. If one word could be used to characterize the ideas held by the participants it would be "variety." It was equally clear that no participant, despite the fact that many had lifetime careers in the organizing and directing of institutes for teachers and other educators, would suggest that his type of institute would be applicable in all and

every case. Again, then, the emphasis on "variety" was augmented by the concept of "appropriate." These ideas will be spelled out in further detail in later sections of this report.

The following report is a very brief summary of the major ideas of the conference participants. The report is to be considered in no way as a strait jacket for institute proposals. In fact, the very opposite is the intent of this report. As will be stated again later, a number of institutions may wish to plan and organize very similar types of institutes because of the similarity of their situation. Other institutions may wish to experiment, innovate, and utilize training techniques adapted from industry, and elsewhere.

The report will consider briefly those items listed on pages 1 and 2 which provided the basic framework around which the conference was organized.

I. What are the dimensions of the school desegregation problem as defined by Title IV?

As the reader will note, Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act calls for a survey of the "lack of equal educational opportunity." This survey will undoubtedly help answer some of the key questions raised by the conference, but unfortunately the findings of the survey are at least 18 months away. Each participant was therefore asked to state the problem as he saw it. The diversity of backgrounds and experiences provided, as one would expect, a diversity of responses. What came out most clearly was that different regions as well as different communities within regions are at different stages in the achievement of equal educational opportunity regardless of race.

Some areas are totally resistant; here the problem of even suggesting that an institute be held would be rejected by the white community. It is probably that here, too, the Negro community would be unable to participate because of possible reprisal. Other communities, although many white voices express resistance, are willing to accede to the letter of the law, if not the spirit, and thus have already indicated a willingness to cooperate in some kind of preparatory training program. In some localities this mutual interest in utilizing the available Federal assistance has already resulted in colleges and universities and adjacent school districts discussing together the establishment of institutes in the very near future.

There was some agreement that larger cities in areas where segregation by law has been enforced might be places where cooperative activities could occur soonest. The problem of definition--"when is a school system desegregated?"--arose, but the general response appeared to be that so-called token desegregation was not what the Civil Rights Law referred to. Institutes therefore would be quite as appropriate to assist school systems in which no integration had taken place at all, as in situations where one or two "mascot" Negroes had been enrolled in previously all white schools. It was clear, too, that even in school systems where complete desegregation had been achieved, many educational problems might still remain unsolved and critical. Such problems as variation in educational achievement, for instance, among different segments of the community could present a pressing training problem for teachers.

Throughout the discussion of the individual participant's statements it was clear that desegregation is occurring as part of a much larger pattern of social change. However, it was also agreed that this larger pattern was not within the purview of the Title IV provision. But within its sections, educational personnel could and indeed should accept leadership

in educational desegregation.

The group was reminded, too, that many cities which had desegregated had, over the space of a decade, become in effect resegregated. This would be the problem of another generation of educators if today's educator ignored or evaded this potential problem. The kinds of institutes--the content explored, the processes and designs developed--could be effective in much more long-range terms if appropriately foreseen, now.

The participants listed many problems which might arise. Among these were:

- -development or use of new curriculum materials, content, and approaches helpful in meeting instructional problems of disadvantaged groups.
- -planning procedures for the conduct of extra-curricular activities in situations involving students from different backgrounds.
- -establishing plans and policies for the assignment of administrative and teaching staff as an integral part of school desegregation.
- -development of understanding of different value and behavior systems and the appropriate educational and psychological response.
- -extending diagnostic skills to identify areas for special educational effort to meet individual differences in educational attainment.

Other items mentioned included: recruitment of white and Negro school personnel for integrated institutes; convincing some school systems and school personnel that there was any problem in connection with desegregation; obtaining appropriate resource leadership and materials for institute participants; difficulties foreseen in community hostility, apathy, or lack of involvement; the impact of track or grouping practices; the use or misuse of test results; and the need for new approaches in pre-service teacher education.

Space precludes a complete listing of the problems identified by the participants. Many will be considered in other sections of this report.

The dimensions of the problem were, indeed, difficult to assess. The map could not be accurately filled in. We are still too ignorant, and perhaps too provincial, seeing our own area or region or field of specialization. It was considered highly important, therefore, that there be continued communication among those actively involved in implementing Title IV. The problem evaded precise description also because it involved not only the politics but the psychology of change, areas again in which scholars and educational practitioners have not generally shared each others understandings.

II. <u>On what basis can priorities be established for the support of institutes under Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act</u>?

The conference addressed itself to this extremely difficult problem throughout one day, meeting in large session with spokesmen presenting varying points of view and then meeting in smaller groups to come to grips with the practical problems of priority determination.

As has been stated, the conference was not asked to and did not expect to--in fact did not want to--establish hard and fast guidelines. Certain large themes emerged, however, which gained at least general approval.

1. It was felt that where several institutions of higher learning could jointly plan with adjacent interested school districts, an institute might have a better chance of achieving its goal. With this general agreement there was the stated belief of several that the institutions of higher learning involved might most appropriately be both Negro and white if the locality is one in which such institutions remain, to all intents, predominantly of one race.

It was further felt to be valuable if the institute planning included consideration of appropriate follow-up assistance available under Sections

403 and 405. Previous workshop directors who were among the conference participants noted that much good has been done in other kinds of workshops, but lacking any machinery for follow-up support for individual teachers or administrators, the workshop experience may have only produced individual frustration. Again and again it was repeated by conference participants that institute experiences, while valuable in and of themselves, would not have the desired impact if follow-up plans were not considered an integral part of total institute planning The inference here was that those institutions of higher learning responsible for organizing and applying for the institutes, would include at all planning levels key school personnel from the school systems in which follow-up activities would be desirable. Again, too, the point was stressed that such school planning personnel include spokesmen for both Negro and white segments of the school districts. If all school superintendents in the country were to meet, it is probable that out of the many thousands, only one or two might be Negro. Thus the planning involving desegregation, in order that it not appear to be planning by white school personnel for Negro school personnel, will need careful consideration by those responsible for requesting and planning institutes.

2. The personnel who would be recruited for institutes could be of several kinds. That is, an institute might be designed wholly for school board members to meet with specially trained legal counsel; or school board members with school administrators of communities where desegregation has been successfully achieved. There might be institutes in which, for example, primary grade teachers only would be involved, whose major focus might be on the learning needs of pupils different from those whom she is used to instructing. This of course would apply equally to white as well as Negro teachers. Similarly, an institute for counselors with the appropriate

employment and vocational personnel of an area, with testing experts and others, could be helpful.

Since the act refers to "school personnel" as those to be served by institutes, conference participants agreed that this was a wide net. School nurses, for instance, might profit from a mutual exhange of problems; school bus drivers might benefit from interracial training sessions. It was pointed out that many professional personnel are already affiliated with organizations which represent their major professional interests--band directors, coaches, social studies teachers, remedial reading teachers, vocational education teachers, school supervisors, art teachers, and so forth. There are a number of honorary sororities and fraternities in professional education, as well as state and local teachers and administrators groups. It was suggested that these organizations might also join forces with local colleges or universities in assisting in the planning and recruiting of personnel for specialized institutes. Such organizations could of course utilize their own local, state, and national meetings to help their membership develop appropriate skills and understandings for orderly school desegregation, as appropriate. Institutes, therefore, could be designed to serve a specialized group in the school organization.

There were repeated requests also for institutes to which <u>teams</u> of school personnel from a given school or system would be enrolled. It was felt that such persons, sharing a common experience, could support each other back home. The resources of the institutes could be used for making more realistic plans for back home application. The team idea is indeed a most attractive one. Sociologically, some warnings might be observed before too hasty decision on this particular point is reached. A team which includes personnel of differing status relationships may suggest a different design for a workshop. If, for example, a principal is present with a teacher,

counselor, perhaps school board member, then all could participate in some general activities. But there might be need for special small group activities for each of the different team members in terms of his or her own area of specialty. It must also be noted that some team members might be selected by local personnel because they were seen as effective barriers to desegregation and invulnerable to institute programs or were so low on the status ladder that any convictions or plans they might bring home could be successfully ignored. The suggestion then in terms of priority and selection of personnel for an institute would depend to a large extent on the perceptive planning of the institute director together with his advisory group from his own institution, from the related school systems, and from the U.S. Office of Education as requested.

It probably need not be pointed out, but it was obvious that all institutes would be interracial in planning, in recruitment, in staffing and in all follow-up plans.

3. Although there was concern that the conference might founder on the big-city resergregated school district as against the never-desegregated system, this discussion, while keen, did not pose particularly critical problems to this particular conference group. It was agreed, however, that although areas in the South where the problems are at the moment most severe, where compliance has been most difficult, might well request and need assistance most; it was also agreed that acute problems of desegregation exist in other parts of the country, and merit consideration and assistance.

4. There were some serious questions raised regarding the role of some major universities in such institutes. It was agreed that they had superior staff resources in many areas, but it was also pointed out that many of them had already acquired a lion's share of project support from many sources,

Federal and otherwise. The idea was suggested that, granted the shortage of trained personnel, institutes developed by the larger universities and their experienced teaching personnel could perhaps be made available to another region of the country where the need might be greater. There was some feeling that benefits would be derived for all concerned. While not underestimating the problems of school segregation which exist in so many parts of the nation, it was at least hoped that some major Eastern or Western university could experiment with teaming its institute staff with the staff of a college or university in an area of critical need elsewhere. It was also pointed out, however, that there might be distinct advantages to be gained by school personnel attending institutes in other sections of the country where they might observe practices which could provide models for back home procedures.

Some critical comments were voiced regarding the inappropriateness of inter-institution rivalry in the pursuit of grants for institutes under the Civil Rights Act. The need, obviously, is too urgent and the problem too significant for any institution to consider requesting an institute for mere status reasons. In this respect, some of the smaller liberal arts, non-public institutions might provide a particular kind of local setting as well as freedom from some kinds of public restrictions which would suggest encouraging such institutions to develop institute plans.

5. A priority high on the list was the need for locating resource personnel not only to aid in the staffing of institutes, but to provide the desired follow-up training and guidance. The staff of the Equal Educational Opportunities Program in the U.S. Office of Education has agreed to compile a list of resource personnel on as wide a base as possible. Institute planners are urged to utilize this service as necessary, and

conference participants and others were also asked to contribute names of persons who might be helpful. There was agreement, however, that such personnel were in extremely short supply, and obviously could not serve all those requesting such service. There was a feeling that college faculties might themselves be attached to some institutes as trainees so that they could return to their home institutions and provide local leadership.

This particular point was re-emphasized in other contexts, but suggests a priority that is of great significance. In this sensitive area of social change, local defensiveness is apt to rise particularly on the part of the white power group. Thus the development of local talent, Negro and white, adequately trained, might constitute a significant aspect of strategy in promoting orderly desegregation.

III. What content, skills, knowledges are most appropriate for such institutes?

The question, as phrased, obviously covered far too much territory. As was pointed out, the selection of content had to be closely related to the participant group. It was also agreed that content and process cannot be separated, though for the purposes of discussion the major focus of one session was on the content question.

In one instance an institute might be designed for primary grade teachers, and the content therefore might well be directed at those questions which would be of greatest concern to this group. If the institute called together superintendents of medium-sized cities, then again the content might be rather different.

Several recurrent themes however, were stressed.

1. It appeared essential that there be understanding of the total community which the institute was operating to serve. If several school

systems and two or three colleges and universities joined forces to sponsor an institute, then it was pointed out that knowledge of the total community in which the schools were operating would be of great concern. Within this general content area, reference was made to the fact that the white community in many instances is quite unaware of the power structure of the Negro community. Too often the leading ministers, a few Negro educators, maybe a prosperous businessman, are considered the key figures in the Negro group. As was made clear, this may be far from the case. Obviously the sentiments, fears, ambitions and wishes of the Negro community need to be accurately assessed as part of the content of an institute concerned with school desegregation.

2. No matter what the clientele of an institute, it was pointed out that almost all of us, Negro and white alike, need to be re-educated when it comes to the myths and historical gaps in our knowledge about the Negro, his antecedents, his role in the American story, and his actual and potential achievement. Removing some of these misconceptions among adults, who in turn could help clarify the views and understandings of children,could pave the way for more amicable resolutions of conflicts. That some of these myths are deeply rooted in our subconscious was made graphic by one of the participants, a psychiatrist, who had, in working with future doctors, identified the same level of folk acceptance of racial differences in this supposedly scientifically trained group that exists in the public at large. The need for such re-education, therefore, appears to suggest a large area of content for appropriate institutes.

3. Stress was placed on the need to gather and utilize the findings of behavioral sciences as they apply to the manifold and complex problems of school desegregation. There is scholarly research which must be tapped in political science, anthropology, social psychology, psychiatry, sociology,

and related interdisciplinary fields such as group dynamics, communications, etc. The insights of specialists in these many fields have until now not been extensively called upon by educators. Yet one could conceive of few problems now faced by the educational profession which could more appropriately make use of the findings from these fields, as well as using the services of the scholars themselves. It was noted that many scholars whose research may be quite relevant are not always able to translate the application of their research to the action level. It is possible that in some future time institutes for behavioral scientists might well be called; institutes in which these behavioral scientists are provided opportunities to identify the applicability of their knowledges to the action needs of school desegregation.

4. The new skills which may be needed for a group embarking on school desegregation were discussed, but opened such a vast area of inquiry that only brief mention could be made of what is possible. Such skills as role-playing; incident control; action research; participant-observer sensitivity; identifying overt vs. covert communication: all of these imply new ways of behaving and new skills to be learned. In the design of institutes, those skills most needed by the given group must be assessed. The participants themselves may be the least competent to identify those skills which they may most need to acquire.

5. At a very practical level, the content of many institutes would, said the conference participants, appropriately include case studies of desegregation situations which worked amicably, and those in which difficulty was encountered. In many places, it was felt, information about successful school desegregation has not been widely disseminated.

6. Two levels of content were discussed: the level of information received, which in turn the individual uses either in transmitting to some-

one else (as in the case of teachers in a classroom) or translating into policy (as in the case of administrators and school board members). A second level of content had to do with the kind of information, if one can use that word, which provides the individual an opportunity to gain knowledge about himself. It was felt by some participants that inability to understand the workings of one's own emotional and irrational areas of life tends to interfere with the individual's ability to hear or observe anything which may interfere with this internal frame of reference, unrelated as it may be to reality. To what extent some institutes may deem it appropriate or useful to explore this content area depends, of course, on the competence of the director, the participants involved, and the resource personnel who will be available.

It was pointed out, however, that no matter how much we may appear to be working on level one type content, as noted above, inevitably we will be invading level two type content. A director of an institute who is unaware of this may find not only minimal outcomes from his efforts, but even rejection and regression. Clear to everyone was the inescapable fact that the problem of race in America has roots deep in irrationality, and desegregation inevitably will trigger such irrationality in even the most well-meaning and well-educated individuals, both white and Negro.

7. Emphasis was placed again and again on the concept of "readiness." The selection of institute content will have to relate, ultimately, to the readiness of the participants. The determination of such readiness in itself poses problems for institute directors. He must listen to many voices and see through many eyes. The help of behavioral scientists skilled in this kind of assessment could possible be very useful. Even the term "readiness" will have different meanings for different groups. Teachers

who are deeply committed to doing the best job of teaching they can, may readily accept a call to an interracial institute to learn better how to teach primary grade reading, for example. This then becomes their point of "readiness." Another group of school personnel, such as school supervisors, may be concerned with the ways in which classroom atmosphere effects self-concept and in turn influences achievement levels. The "readiness" of this group, then, for another kind of content, is obvious.

It must be pointed out, again, however, that what may appear on the surface to be the individual's own perception of his "readiness," may indeed be only the beginning of his awareness of his own needs to grow and learn. Thus the institute, in its planning, as it considers starting where the participants appear to be, must continually appraise where they are going, and change content and design as the group grows in new insights and learnings.

IV. <u>What designs and processes for proposed institutes hold particular promise for optimal learnings</u>?

The literature on how adults learn, or relearn, has not been generally available to the educational groups planning institutes for other educators. It was noted, however, that research in such areas is scanty and nonconclusive. The major points in institute planning, taking into consideration both design and process appeared to be these:

1. An institute needs extensive data about those who are participants. Too often institutes are planned without enough thought given to those who will come. What are their expectations? Do they expect lectures? Entertainment? Depth psychology? Exchange of skill? Sharing of materials?

What previous inter-racial experiences have the participants had, and how have these experiences affected their perceptions of the problems to

be dealt with? What variation in such experiences exists among the participants in a workshop? If, for instance, some school personnel have had little or no inter-racial experience, while others have had many pleasant such experiences, the sharing of insights gained can be very supportive.

2. Some educators appear to be allergic to anything which sounds like "group dynamics" or "group process." If this is so, then the labels for such procedures may need to be changed. Many of the basic principles of such procedures, however, have been validated by intensive research. Industrial organizations, whose main interest is profit, seem to find "group dynamics" in its various forms and manifestations, to make a considerable contribution to their goals. Why educators are so distrustful of approaches of this sort remains an unanswered question.

3. Whatever the duration of an institute, be it three days or once a month for a year, planning should take into account a deliberate sequence of experiences. What is now known about how adults learn can well be applied to the organization, the "design" of an institute experience. Many institutes and workshops for teachers have followed a standard pattern of morning lectures, presentations or programs, followed by afternoon smaller group activity on some kind of project, interspersed with field trips, picnics or other diversions. Such a pattern, while agreeable to participants and relatively easy to plan on the part of institute directors, has not always resulted in noticeable increments of behavioral change back home. There was some agreement that more creative and more sophisticated institute designs needed to be sought. This did not imply, however, that the kind of format to which teachers and others are acclimated should not be utilized where their personnel make-up, might preclude innovating on too many fronts.

4. It was apparent that some of the more interesting and possibly more effective institute or workshop patterns were relatively unknown. The extensive citywide involvement via open-ended television, pioneered by Dr. Eugene Johnson, for instance, in St. Louis, was news to many conference participants who had for years been in the midst of institute and workshop activities. The need to exchange such experiences as well as evaluate those which had taken place was clearly apparent.

5. Some discussion pointed out the differential learnings that might be expected from short-term intensive live-in workshops, as against longer, commuter-type workshops. There are understandably places where an inter-racial residential experience might, at this juncture, be impossible. By and large, however, it was felt that the gains to be achieved by these very important informal relationships are such that the live-in institute can be strongly recommended.

6. In planning both the process and content aspects of an institute, there was general agreement that the findings of the behavioral sciences must be utilized. Not only should such data be available to participants, but scholars representing a number of disciplines could aid in planning and staffing institutes. For instance, if a psychiatrist were to advance his view of the expected responses of young children in a newly desegregated situation, a sociologist and an anthropologist might well be asked to comment upon his observations. The problem would gain greater illumunation via this kind of inter-disciplinary exchange.

V. <u>What strategies are of greatest potential in terms of school change, in an area such as this fraught with acute community emotion</u>?

Schools change relatively less drastically than some observers might

either note or wish. The times, however, appear to be propitious for some significant changes in the structure of the school and in the deployment of teacher personnel. The value of viewing some successful innovations which may support school desegregation was suggested.

The problem of strategy, however, is a difficult one to grapple with. Institutes are too often seen as separate entities. As has been pointed out already, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act makes it possible for school and college personnel to do some strategic planning, and utilize Federal support and consultant help. It was pointed out that there is no standard continuum from total segregation, through token desegregation, to actual desegregation, to final integration. A neat model does not exist, as we know from case studies of many communities. Some localities can make the jump from one end of the continuum to the other almost overnight. Others may become fixated at one point along the way, but with appropriate help skip some intervening steps. Strategic thinking suggests some sensitive appraisal of a given school system, systems, or localities, and then after such study make proposals for the utilization of certain kinds of groups of consultants, types of institutes, numbers of institutes, locations of institutes, and even the sequence of institutes for particular personnel.

Some participants perceived the principal as a key figure in the educational program, and felt that he should particularly be involved in training institutes. Others noted that the most well-meaning principal cannot operate under an ambiguous policy. Also, of course, a determined teacher (on tenure) can sabotage the best efforts of the most adroit administrators.

Yet in many areas the strategic persons can be located if one looks carefully. It is these persons whose support will be crucial in some situations. One need is greater depth of insight into the power structure of the school as an institution in terms of the facilitation of change.

Although a beginning has been made, there is little research to guide school personnel in planning educational change. It would be hoped that one outcome of the current institute and grant program in desegregation might be to throw more light on the ways in which very different kinds of educational institutions and situations can deliberately and more easily adapt to new educational expectations.

VI. What kinds of short-term evaluation and long-term research would be valuable?

Certainly every institute director, every participating school system, and the sponsoring Federal agency would like to know whether the institute experience has been worthwhile. Thus some kinds of evaluations will be in order. The plan for follow-up of institutes provides one kind of evaluation. Shifts in attitudes and understandings on the part of participants can provide some pertinent data, through pre- and post-testing of various kinds.

Although research is not a major focus of the institutes, it appeared to many of the research-oriented participants that here was a very unique opportunity to study social change and assess the differential impact on different individuals of varying kinds of experiences under a variety of circumstances. It is hoped that research interests will be roused to plan research studies independent of the institutes themselves, and call upon other Federal or nonfederal funding resources for support.

Of major concern, however, is that we do not repeat our mistakes, or continue to do that which is of minimal value. One of the easiest things for an institute director to achieve is a feeling on the part of the participants that they had a wonderful experience! Yet this level of evaluation will provide little if any guidance for the planning of subsequent

efforts. It is vital that we learn from what we are trying to do in the next few months. Research, if adequately conceived and carried out, can certainly reveal more than we whose egos are involved in seeing that our efforts succeed! Those planning institutes are thus encouraged to call upon available research talent in their own school systems or institutions or elsewhere so that data can be gathered which will help guide the plans for succeeding years.

VII. What kinds of follow-up activities might be considered?

As has been noted, throughout the conference discussion there was awareness of and appreciation for the need for institutes to be planned in terms of later follow-up aid wherever feasible.

Another point, related to the above, but one that emerged as the conference continued, was the possible need for an institute for institute directors. It became apparent that even the consideration of follow-up activities required the kind of thinking and planning which has not typically been the concern of organizers of workshops or institutes. It was also increasingly clear that problems of content, design, strategy, research, were all of such a complex nature that whatever help could be provided by the Equal Educational Opportunities Program would be valued.

Time did not permit extended discussion of this idea, but many participants submitted their reactions in writing. Many felt such an institute for directors would be helpful if set in a "clinic" atmosphere; that is, where specific practical help would be provided. Several suggested smaller meetings by regions, with specialized help available. Another reaction was that it would be useful to bring together institute directors at the end of the summer for an exchange of ideas and experiences.

Summary

Mention was made at several times of the many other programs in the Federal government now working upon the same general area of civil rights. Institutes for teachers of culturally disadvantaged youth and many aspects of the Poverty Program touch on one phase of the problem. Educators are urged to utilize the Equal Educational Opportunities Program to gain information about other Federal resources which might support, supplement, or even be preferable to that available under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act.

Two key words dominated the thinking of the conference participants as they discussed institutes: "variety: and "appropriateness." To this we want to add, "urgency."

As an institute in microcosm, we were reminded by Father Trafford Maher, in his summary statement, that many of us have been operating perhaps under an old and outmoded frame of interracial exchange. That, indeed, the time has come for white and Negro to enter into open, honest, and even heated discussion if we are to move forward significantly. Now that we have been given the legal foundation, and the financial support, it is incumbent upon all of us to make the strenuous, even at times dangerous, steps towards the elimination of the blight of segregation in the educational lives and experiences of our children.

Because of the press of time, I must perforce take all blame for errors of omission and commission in summarizing the conference. Any distortions or biases in reporting are mine, and I merely beg the indulgence of my colleagues who so generously gave their time to the conference. I also would invite their comments, as well as those of any other readers which may help clarify any future, more extensive summary, budget permitting.

Appendix I

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON INSTITUTES

December 16 - 19, 1964

Conference Roster

Conference Guests:

Dr. Donald C. Agnew
Southern Association of Colleges and
Secondary Schools
Suite 592
795 Peach Street, North East
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Dr. T. P. Baker
Assistant Superintendent
Austin Public Schools
701 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas

Dr. Kenneth Benne
Director, Human Relations Center
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. Max Birnbaum
Director of Education and Training
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York 22, New York

Dr. Eli M. Bower
National Institute of Mental Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. Henry M. Brickell
Director of Curriculum
Manhassett Public School System
Manhassett, Long Island, New York

Dr. Ernest Campbell
Department of Sociology
Vanderbilt University
Station B, Box 1811
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Benjamin E. Carmichael
Superintendent
Chattanooga Public Schools
Board of Education
1161 West 40th Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Mr. Roger Cartwright
Bank Street College
New York, New York

Dr. Paul Cooke
Director of Programs
Model School Division of the
Public Schools of the
District of Columbia
Miner Building
Georgia Avenue and Euclid
Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Muriel Crosby
Assistant Superintendent
Wilmington Public Schools
1400 Washington Street
Wilmington 1, Delaware

Dr. William Engbretson
Dean
School of Education
Indiana State College
Terre Haute, Indiana

Mr. Mario Fantini, Consultant
Ford Foundation
477 Madison Avenue
New York City, New York

Dr. Marie Fielder
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Conference Guests (Continued):

Mr. Otis Finley, Jr.
Associate Director
National Urban League
14 East 48th Street
New York, New York

The Reverend Albert Foley, S. J.
Chairman, Department of Sociology and Psychology
Spring Hill College
Mobile, Alabama

Dr. John Hope Franklin
Professor of History
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Theodore Freedman
Southern Director
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
1513 Melrose Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Dr. Keith Goldhammer
Associate Director
Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Dr. Edmund Gordon
Director of the School of Education
Yeshiva University
110 West 57th Street
New York 19, New York

Dr. John D. Greene
Director of Instruction
Baton Rouge Parish School Board
Box 2950
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Burton Henry
Professor of Education
California State College
5151 State College Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032

Dr. C. W. Hunnicutt
School of Education
200 Slocum Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Dr. Eugene Johnson
Executive Director
Adult Education Association of the U. S. A.
1225 - 19th Street, North West
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dr. John Letson
Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue, South West
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Arthur Levin
Staff Director
The Potomac Institute, Inc.
1501 - 18th Street, North West
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Herman Long
President
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

The Reverend Trafford Maher, S.J.
Director, Department of Education
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

Dr. G. D. McGrath
Dean
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Dr. Kenneth Moreland
Department of Sociology
Randolph Macon Women's College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Dr. James Nabrit
President
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

Conference Guests (Continued):

Dr. Charles H. Parrish
Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

Dr Truman M. Pierce
Dean
College of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Dr. Wilson Riles, Chief
Bureau of Intergroup Relations
California State Department of Education
4246 Warren Avenue
Sacramento 22, California

Dr. Malcolm F. Rosenberg, Jr.
New Orleans Public School System
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Dr. Margaret Rowley
Chairman
Department of Social Sciences
Morris Brown College
Atlanta 18, Georgia

Dr. James Scott
Assistant Superintendent
St. Louis Board of Education
Instruction Department
911 Locust Street
St. Louis, Missouri

Dr. Fannie Shaftel
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dr. Glenn Snider
Chairman
Executive Committee
Southwest Center for Human
Relations Studies
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dr. Morton Sobel
Assistant National Director
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.
1712 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

Dr. A. F. Tuttle
Assistant Dean
Stetson University
DeLand, Florida

Dr. Harold N. Stinson
George Peabody College
Box 13
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Lloyd Trump
Executive Director
National Association of
Secondary School Principals
1201 - 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Dr. William Van Til
Chairman, Department of
Secondary Education
New York University
New York, New York

Dr. Frederick P. Venditti
College of Education
Department of Educational
Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. Herbert Wey
Assistant Dean
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

Dr. Louis J. West
Chairman, Department of Psychiatry
University of Oklahoma
School of Medicine
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. Kimball Wiles, Dean
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Dr. W. Cody Wilson
Sutton Hall 206
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Conference Guests (Continued):

Dr. Cliff W. Wing, Jr.
Director of Admissions and
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Tulane University
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

Representing the U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Francis Keppel
U.S. Commissioner of Education
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Broadus Butler
Special Assistant to the Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Edward Gordon
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. W. Stanley Kruger
U.S. Office of Education

Mrs. Phyllis McClure
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Nathan Pitts
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. David Seeley
Special Assistant to the Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Joseph Shea
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Donald Sullivan
U.S. Office of Education

Miss Harriet Ziskin
U.S. Office of Education

Representing the University
of Maryland

Dr. Jean D. Grambs
Project Director
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of Maryland

Dr. Richard Neville
Assistant Project Director
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of Maryland

Mr. Leonard P. Oliver
Conference Coordinator
University College
Center of Adult Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. James Raths
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of Maryland

Dr. Gordon Liddle
School of Education
University of Maryland

Dr. Eric Seidman
School of Education
University of Maryland

Recorders:

Dr. Robert G. Risinger
Chairman
Department of Secondary Education
College of Education
University of Maryland

Dr. David Rhoads
Assistant Professor
Personnel Services in Education
College of Education
University of Maryland

Dr J. Paul Anderson
Associate Professor of Education
Associate Director of Administrative Internships for
Secondary School Improvement, NASSP, NEA
College of Education
University of Maryland

Mr. Thomas McPherson
Associate Director
National Conference of Christians and Jews
Southern Building
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Albert Klevan
Assistant Professor
Institute for Child Study
College of Education
University of Maryland

Dr. V. Phillips Weaver
Assistant Professor
College of Education
University of Maryland

Appendix II

Address by Commissioner Francis Keppel

At Leadership Conference on Training Institutes

For School Personnel on Desegregation

Center of Adult Education — Wednesday, December 16, 1964

The University of Maryland

Dr. Grambs, Dean Anderson, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to thank the University of Maryland, and in particular -- Dean Anderson, Dr. Jean Grambs, and Dr. Richard Neville, for their effective efforts in making this important conference possible.

We very much appreciate the fact that forty-five outstanding and extremely busy educators, behavioral scientists, and human relations specialists have taken the time to meet together for three days for the purpose of giving the Office of Education -- their advice on crucial questions in the area of desegregation, which should receive attention in institutes which the Office of Education will support under Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This conference marks the most significant step taken thus far to launch the Office of Education's Equal Educational Opportunities Program, authorized under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The intent and ultimate design of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is to end discrimination in practice, to close the gap between the ideals we have professed in American life, and the unsatisfactory reality in which we have lived.

In speaking to an Urban League Conference held in Washington last week, President Johnson said:

> No task is more deeply rooted in the complexities of American life. Poverty and tradition, fear and ignorance, the structure of our society and the workings of our economy, all converge on this enormous wrong which has troubled the American conscience from the beginning. Its just solution is essential, not only to give the full blessings of freedom to Negroes, but to liberate all of us.

The President added another challenge which holds particular meaning for educators. "We must," he said, "open the doors of opportunity. But we must also equip our people to walk through those doors."

For too long, educators <u>should</u> have been giving -- and have not given-- their best resources and attention to the children who require them most -- the children of poverty and discrimination.

For too long, we have failed to recognize, and act on our recognition, that "separate but equal" is not freedom and is not equality -- in the South, in the North, or anywhere else.

For too long, we have reacted, not acted -- followed, not led. And we are not alone.

Let us turn for a moment to some of the specific responsibilities of education, of the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Civil Rights Act. Your cooperation as national leaders is essential if these responsibilities are to be met.

The basic intent of the Congress is stated precisely and clearly under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Here, with regard to federally-assisted programs -- in education and in other areas -- the Congress has stated:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

To the Office of Education, this means that Federal financial resources

must never be used to assist one group, by virtue of color or national origin, to achieve an advantage over another.

It means that Federal funds must never be used to perpetuate segregation in any of its manifest forms.

-Under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are given responsibility for active promotion and assistance in the desegregation of public education.

-First, we will conduct a survey and report to the President and to the Congress on the availability of equal educational opportunities in public education at every level.

-Further, we in the Office of Education, will, upon request, assist local schools and communities in the preparation, adoption and implementation of plans for desegregation. We hope to make available accurate and effective information regarding special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.

Section 405 of the Civil Rights Act authorizes the Commissioner of Education to provide grants to school boards to aid them in employing specialists to assist with educational problems occasioned by desegregation, and to develop in-service training programs designed to better equip school personnel to cope with school desegregation problems.

Finally, the Civil Rights Act authorizes us to arrange institutes for the special training of school personnel who, in turn, will enable our schools to deal more effectively with the educational problems of desegregation. During the next three days you will be addressing yourselves to the most important problems which should receive attention in these institutes, you will be making recommendations about the kinds of persons who should attend them, and you will be discussing some promising practices

which have been developed over the years which should prove effective in these institutes.

It seems to me that it is most significant that you school superintendents, professors and deans of colleges of education, psychiatrists, psychologists, anthropologists, historians, sociologists, and human relations specialists have taken this time out of your very busy lives to work with us on this important matter. It is of crucial importance that the institutes supported under Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act make a major contribution toward improving the ability of school personnel to cope effectively with problems occasioned by desegregation. These problems call for training which will better equip school personnel to understand themselves, their students, their communities, and sound educational practices, to the end that they will become more effective teachers in a period of great change. In addition, as each of us knows, many of our Negro students have not had educational opportunities equivalent to those of white students, and for that reason, in some instances do not initially meet the achievement levels of some of their fellow students when desegregation begins. We know, therefore, that we must equip our teachers to bridge this educational gap as quickly and as effectively as possible.

The discussions in which you will be engaging during the next few days offer exciting possibilities for a major thrust in improving the ability of school personnel to deal with these problems. I cannot emphasize enough how much we of the Office of Education appreciate your good work. Your guidance will be of major importance to us, and to the colleges and universities which receive the report on this conference.

These tasks in which we are now engaged, on which your counsel is being sought, are new to the Federal Government. Undoubtedly, mistakes will be made. But the importance of effective action cannot be over-estimated.

So we shall move to execute the intent of the law, not only because law and morality require affirmative action, but because good educational practice demands it. By breaking the lock-step of discrimination, we will liberate the full potential of American education.

Universal and voluntary compliance with the Civil Rights Act is, of course, our objective and our hope. Our schools, in helping to attain it, can teach us all that integration will not impair the quality of our schools, as so many fear. On the contrary, we can achieve both quality and equality in education at one and the same time. This, as I see it, is education's critical assignment for 1965.

When we speak of equality in education, however, let us be clear what we mean. To end discrimination and segregation will not alone produce it, nor will the mere intermixing of races assure true equality. If we would achieve equality in substance, not merely in form, we must recognize that our immediate challenge is presented by today's children of poverty and discrimination, and that this calls for initiative above and beyond the fine print of the law.

The challenge of civil rights challenges us all--wherever we are, however it finds us. If education has flaws -- and it has -- it also has enormous potential for leadership. I have faith that we will exercise that leadership at this major turning point for American education.

Our schools should be, can be, the people's major instrument to democratize society, to give substance and meaning to the promise of America. When the creative energies of leaders like you who are assembled here today, are allied and joined with the best traditions of American education, then we shall find beyond <u>legislation</u> for equality, the <u>reality</u> of equality -- in education and in every other realm of our lives.